

GARY E. SCHNITZER, ESQ.  
Nevada Bar No. 395  
ADAM J. WAX, ESQ.  
Nevada Bar No. 12126  
KRAVITZ, SCHNITZER, & JOHNSON, CHTD.  
8985 So. Eastern Avenue, Suite 200  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89123  
Telephone: (702) 352-6666  
Facsimile: (702) 362-2203  
Email: [gschnitzer@ksjattorneys.com](mailto:gschnitzer@ksjattorneys.com)  
[awax@ksjattorneys.com](mailto:awax@ksjattorneys.com)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff,*  
*Trade Show Services, LTD.*  
*d/b/a Pro-Tect Security*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

TRADE SHOW SERVICES, LTD., a Nevada  
Corporation, d/b/a PRO-TECT SECURITY  
SERVICES,

Plaintiff,

vs.

INTEGRATED SYSTEMS IMPROVEMENT  
SERVICES, INC., an Arizona Corporation;  
INTEGRATED SYSTEMS IMPROVEMENT  
SERVICES, INC., d/b/a SPECIAL  
INTELLIGENCE SERVICE, an Arizona  
Corporation; DOE INDIVIDUALS I through X,  
inclusive; and ROE BUSINESS ENTITIES I  
through X, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:17-cv-01685-JAD-NJK

**STIPULATION AND ORDER TO FILE PLAINTIFF'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF  
MOTION TO DISQUALIFY DEFENDANTS' ATTORNEYS ON JANUARY 30,  
2018 (SECOND REQUEST)**

Plaintiff, TRADE SHOW SERVICES, LTD., d/b/a PRO-TECT SECURITY SERVICES  
("Pro-Tect"), by and through its counsel of record, Gary E. Schnitzer, Esq., and Adam Wax,  
Esq., of the law firm Kravitz, Schnitzer & Johnson, Chtd., and Defendant, Integrated Systems  
Improvement Services, Inc., d/b/a Special Intelligence Services ("Defendant"), by and through  
its counsel of record, Michael D. Rawlins, Esq., of the law firm Durham Jones & Pinegar, hereby

1 stipulate and agree that Plaintiff will file its Reply to Defendant's Opposition to Plaintiff's  
2 Motion to Disqualify Defendants' Attorneys on or before January 30, 2018. Defendant's  
3 Opposition was filed on December 26, 2017, making Pro-Tect's Reply due on or before January  
4 2, 2018. *ECF No. 32*. The Parties previously mutually agreed by stipulation that January 16,  
5 2018, would be Pro-Tect's deadline to file its Reply in support of *ECF No. 28*. *ECF No. 36*. Due  
6 to the holidays, the Parties' schedules and the person(s) from Pro-Tect that counsel requires to  
7 respond to the Opposition being committed to CES for the next 7-10 days<sup>1</sup>, unforeseen  
8 circumstances, and additional matters necessitating the attention of the Parties and their counsel,  
9 combined with counsel's duty to provide a complete response to the Opposition, the Parties have  
10 mutually agreed in good faith that Pro-Tect shall have additional time for its Reply. Thus, the  
11 Parties have mutually agreed that Pro-Tect shall have until on or before **January 30, 2018**, as  
12 Pro-Tect's deadline to file its Reply in support of *ECF No. 28*. The Parties agree that this  
13 Stipulation is being submitted in good faith, and not for purposes of delay. Further, this  
14 Stipulation is made in accordance with Local Rule 7-1 and for good cause.

15 **IT IS SO AGREED AND STIPULATED.**


16 KRAVITZ, SCHNITZER & JOHNSON

DURHAM JONES & PINEGAR

17  
18 By /s/ Adam J. Wax, Esq.  
19 Gary E. Schnitzer, Esq.  
20 NV Bar No.395  
21 Adam J. Wax, Esq.  
22 NV Bar No. 12126  
23 8985 S. Eastern Ave., Suite 200  
24 Las Vegas, NV 89123  
25 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

By /s/ Michael D. Rawlins, Esq.  
Michael D. Rawlins  
NV Bar No. 5467  
10785 W. Twain Ave., Suite 200  
Las Vegas, NV 89135  
*Attorneys for Defendant*

26 **IT IS SO ORDERED:**

27   
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
DATED: January 9, 2018

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff Pro-Tect is a security company and one of Pro-Tect's largest contracts is to provide security for the CES show currently ongoing in Las Vegas, Nevada. As such, Pro-Tect's representative(s) are working at CES exclusively for the next 7-10 days, making them unavailable to assist in the Reply.